

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,243	01/16/2002		Titus Lo	12177/13802	5223
23838	7590	02/03/2005		EXAMINER	
KENYON &			NGUYEN, SIMON		
1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2685	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/046,243	LO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	SIMON D NGUYEN	2685					
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replection of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) daywill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 N</u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 November 2004</u> .						
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-22</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-22</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received.  Is have been received in Application  It is not been received in Application	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413) ite					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newman et al. (5,907,816) in view of Antonio et al. (5,621,752).

Regarding claim 9, Newman discloses an array antenna for a base station (figs.7-8), comprising: capturing (receiving) wireless signals on a plurality of antennas (column 4 lines 42-62); forming a plurality of beams from outputs of the antennas (column 10 line 46); selecting beams (column 5 lines 59-67, column 6 lines 57-58); outputting, from the receivers, processed signals corresponding to the beams; and extracting a message (information) from the processed signal (column 7 lines 4-24). However, Newman does not specifically disclose selecting a subset of beams.

Antonio discloses a base station having a beam former for forming a plurality of beams from outputs of the antennas and selecting a subset of the beams for processing by a plurality of receivers, wherein the subset includes the strongest beam (column 7 lines 8-14, 51-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Newman, modified by Antonio in order to improve signal performance for each transceiver in a base station.

Application/Control Number: 10/046,243

Art Unit: 2685

Regarding claims 10-13, Newman further discloses the steps of assigning weights to the processed signals (column 13 lines 35-39); demodulating signals (column 7 lines 18-19); the strongest beam is processed by a primary receiver (#18) (column 5 lines 59-67, fig.1) and other beams of the subset are processed by auxiliary receiver (#18a of fig.1)(column 6 lines 53-55).

Regarding claim 14, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 9, wherein Antonio discloses the switch matrix (#228) selecting a subset of the beam signals to a set of receivers. Since the switch matrix of Antonio used for selecting a subset of beams to assign for a plurality of receivers, respectively, the switch matrix of Antonio is obviously an exclusion logic switch.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 14.

Regarding claims 15-16, Newman further discloses a digital processor for selecting, weighting, and demodulating signal (column 7 lines 25-27).

Regarding claims 18-19, these claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 12-13.

Regarding claim 20-22, these claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 15.

# Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 10/12/04, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 9, 14, and 17 under Newman et al. (5,907,816) have been fully

Application/Control Number: 10/046,243

Art Unit: 2685

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the final rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Antonio et al. (5,621,752).

Antonio, discloses a base station selecting a subset of the beams for processing by a plurality of receivers wherein the subset of the beams includes the strongest beams (column 7 lines 8-14, 51-55). Since the switch matrix of Antonio used for selecting a subset of beams to assign for a plurality of receivers, respectively, the switch matrix of Antonio is obviously an exclusion logic switch.

### Conclusion

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Feuerstein et al. (6,055,230) discloses a base station having a plurality of antennas to receive signal beams wherein a digital switch selects the best six of the beams in twelve logical signals (column 6 lines 27-38).
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (703) 305-4385.

Application/Control Number: 10/046,243

Art Unit: 2685

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Simon Nguyen

January 31, 2005

Sum Jamen